hensive system. And so on up to the highest dominant, who is the self-conscious ego. He in turn controls the whole in a general way, by mediation of the hierarchy of subordinates, in a manner closely analogous to the manner in which the commander-in-chief of an army controls all its parts. He has no detailed knowledge of the parts and their workings; accordingly he can give no detailed commands to the various minor parts. He receives only a condensed extract of all the information obtained by and directly concerning all the parts; his knowledge of their working is indirect and general; and correspondingly his commands are in general terms only, and have to be elaborated in detail as they are passed down the hierarchy to * officers ' of lower and lower rank commanding systems successively smaller and of more specialized functions.[1]

The great merit of this hypothesis is that it enables us to understand what has long been a standing paradox —namely, the combination of the unitary conscious activity manifested in our volitions (which the whole organism obeys) with the reality of subordinate concurrent streams of mental activity, subconscious so far as the Ego is concerned. It illuminates also the liability of the self-conscious activities of the Ego to be impoverished by the failure of his dominance over parts of the total system; so that he finds himself at times struggling on even terms against some insubordinate

[1] This view is not peculiar to myself but has been stated

forcibly by the present Earl Balfour in his presidential address to the Society for Psychical Research, he having been led to it primarily by his studies in that field where, as he shows, it meets many needs. I have adduced further evidence and reasoning in its support in a recent article. * Relations between Dissociation and Repression*.